

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of DWAYNE ANTHONY
LAWHORN, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

LEAH LAWHORN,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED
September 16, 2003

No. 243919
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 00-386161

Before: Smolenski, P.J., and Murphy and Wilder, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

Respondent's only argument on appeal is that petitioner did not make reasonable efforts to reunite respondent with her child as required by statute. MCL 712A.18f(4). We review a trial court's findings of fact for clear error. *In re Ramsey*, 229 Mich App 310, 314; 581 NW2d 291 (1998). The foster care worker, Shelly Colbeck, testified that respondent was given a referral for domestic violence counseling, but that respondent did not take advantage of the referral. Respondent was given two housing referrals, although only one of the referrals contacted her. Colbeck explained that petitioner did not offer financial assistance to respondent for housing because petitioner's policy was to do so only when reunification was imminent. Colbeck further testified that respondent was given assistance with budgeting her money from the Court-Appointed Special Advocate. Colbeck sought a parenting skills class that focused on special needs children, but was unable to locate one. At the July 2001 review hearing, the trial court praised the "extraordinary efforts" made to identify a mother/baby foster home for respondent and her child.

It is clear from the record that petitioner made numerous efforts to provide services to respondent, but that respondent failed to take advantage of, or failed to benefit from, many of the services offered. Respondent's appellate brief does not indicate what other services should have been offered to her or how petitioner's efforts were inadequate. We therefore conclude that the

trial court did not clearly err in finding that petitioner made reasonable efforts to reunite respondent with her child.

Also, the record does not support respondent's claim that she substantially complied with the treatment plan. Although respondent completed parenting classes and consistently visited her child, she failed to satisfactorily complete many other important requirements of the treatment plan. The record demonstrates that respondent was unable to maintain consistent employment, did not obtain suitable housing, and did not complete domestic violence counseling. Furthermore, there was evidence that respondent was unable to handle her child's difficult behavior and that she "would need almost constant support in order to manage Dwayne's care on a daily basis." In light of this evidence, respondent's claim that she substantially complied with the treatment plan is without merit.

Affirmed.

/s/ Michael R. Smolenski

/s/ William B. Murphy

/s/ Kurtis T. Wilder